

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 2, 2004

LB 998

that are serious, because I think changes ought to be brought about in those bills. But in order that the record is clear on what this proposed amendment would do, in the committee amendment, which consists of a half a sheet of paper, beginning in line 6, according to my amendment, these words would be stricken: "The increases in coverage requirements made by this legislative bill in sections 44-2824 and 44-2827 shall apply to policies issued or renewed and risk-loss trust years which commence after the operative date of this act." I would like to ask Senator Pederson a question before I proceed, because this is a question going to the understanding of this proposed amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you yield, Senator Pederson?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Pederson, this language, if I understand it, is simply saying that the bill will not impact any of these items that already exist at the time the bill takes effect, but only prospectively, or after the date of the bill's effectiveness, will the bill come into play. Is that correct?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Yes. For example, a physician would have a medical malpractice insurance policy effective on a certain date. This bill will not become effective to that policy until after January 1 of next year, which means that their current policy of insurance will continue until a renewal period of time after January 1 of 2005.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And when that period comes, this bill will automatically require a higher premium?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Pederson, I'm not going to try to do it, but would this be the area of the law where an attempt could be made to increase the maximum recovery of a person who is victimized by an act of malpractice? Or would that be a different section of statute, if you know?